





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/601,545	03/29/2001	Francois Breynaert	60130-865	7785	
7.	590 09/12/2002				
Carlson Gaskey & Olds 400 W Maple Road Suite 350			EXAMINER		
			CUEVAS, PEDRO J		
Birmingham, MI 48009				- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2834	^	
			DATE MAILED: 09/12/2002	, 19	
				' (

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/601,545	BREYNAERT, FRANCOIS			
navioury notion	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Pedro J. Cuevas	2834			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 23 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applic) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offi timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (2)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding arm the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the ma	ng date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP FR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>23 August 2002</u>. A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b 	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of				
		Topic NOTE halanda			
(a)		see NOTE below);			
	•				
issues for appeal; and/or	•	, , , , ,			
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	inally rejected claims.			
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .					
Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s): <u>35 U.S.C. § 102(b) of claim</u>	<u>s 1 and 4</u> .			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		idered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).				
10. Other:	<	ZERIMAS ROTEEM			
		TTTUSSOM TURKSOM EMANGINER TYCHNOLUSY GENTER 2800			

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)





Application No. 09/601,545

Continuation of 2. NOTE: since the addition of the term "separatelly" in claim 1 overcomes the present grounds of rejection of this claim, the examiner will need to further consider the prior art of record.